

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 16, 2006 in which claims 1-18 were rejected.

In Section 3, claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ji et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6836657 B2).

In Section 7, claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rao (US Pub. No. 2004/0123282 A1).

In Section 12, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ji, in view of Shipp (US Pub. No. 2005/0049997 A1).

In Section 14, claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ji, in view of Rao.

In Section 24, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ji, in view of Rao and in further view of O'Neill (US Pub No. 2004/0215755 A1).

In Section 26, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ji, in view of O'Neill.

In the Amendment submitted in this communication with the USPTO Office, various of the original claims are changed in ways believed related only to matters of form. For example, reference numerals/ labels are removed from the claims, which change does not affect the scope of the claims per MPEP § 608.01(m) (the use of reference characters is considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims). Also, the claims are amended to remove "step of" language. Furthermore, a preamble is removed from claims 1

and 18 and recited in the body of the claim. The claims are amended to remove "step of" language.

Moreover, means-plus-function claims 21 and 22, having similar scope as claim 15, are added. The new claims 21 and 22 do not add new matter and should be allowed as long as claim 15 is allowed. Also dependent claim 19 and 20 is added: claim 19 is of similar scope as claim 5 and claim 20 is fully supported by the specification (e.g., page 6, lines 16-17).

References quoted by the Examiner were filed at the following dates: Ji et al. was filed on November 12, 2002; Rao was filed on August 7, 2003 and O'Neill was filed on April 1, 2003.

The Applicant submits AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION under 37 CFR 1.131 by one of the inventors (Mika Leppinen) declaring that the actual reduction to practice (with a working prototype successfully tested) of the present invention occurred before November 12, 2002 thus antidating the filing dates of all references quoted by the Examiner which are listed above. Thus rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) comprised in the Office Action of October 16, 2006 are unapplicable and should be dismissed.

The Applicant requests the withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) listed in the Office Action dated October 16, 2006.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of October 16, 2006 having been shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-21 to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Anatoly Frenkel
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 54,106

AZF/mef
January 11, 2007
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234